

HCP Team Annual Winter Meeting
March 8, 2006
9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.
Holiday Inn Hotel & Convention Center (new)
1101 Amber Ave., Stevens Point

1. Anti-trust announcement

Jim Christenson

Dave Lentz (HCP Coordinator) opened the meeting with a greeting.

Jimmy delivered the Anti-trust statement. He introduced Cyndi Blalach as a new DNR attorney who will be taking over for him on HCP matters.

2. Welcome, Introductions, Announcements

Matt Krumenauer, IOC Chair

- Introduce and welcome new partners, new staff
- Introduce IOC representatives
- Matt announced the establishment of the Natural Resource Foundation KBB Conservation Fund
 - NRF Escrow Account (agreement available on request)
 - Thanked IP for generous donation
- Asked attendees to think about ideas for the 2006 summer field trip
- Matt asked that any volunteers to be Karner Blue Hotline Flight Status Field Reporters should talk to Joe Henry. Joe will send also be sending out a request for help with this. The hotline reports are only as good as the incoming field reports.
- Monitoring 2006: The monitoring program will be similar to last year. Information will be sent to all affected partners by the HCP Data Manager by March 31
- Reminder: Monitoring training is required at once every 5 years. Consider attending this year to remove confusion of the last 2 years and because of likely changes to the sampling plan and report forms.

3. HCP Implementation Assessment and Permit Renewal

Assessing the HCP thus far and defining future direction (Adaptive Management)

Matt introduced this agenda item. Matt explained how we came to this juncture, the ideas that spurred on the 5-point plan. Dave came up with the idea in response to discussions with FWS regarding Safe Harbor and the prospects of renewing the ITP for up to 50 years. The basic process that lead to the proposed plan include adaptive management; the key factors are that we have significantly more Kbb's than we originally thought, and it is cost of regulatory compliance is not commensurate with the needs of the species. The main risk to Kbb's in WI is the potential loss of early successional stage habitat resulting from the loss of beneficial disturbance management, i.e., partners avoid occupied areas or leaving the partnership. The key to the success of the program are good partners and strong relationships. What can we do to remove barriers and provide incentives for partners to continue?

Dave Lentz gave an overview of day's agenda, and the goals & objectives of meeting. He reviewed the 5-point plan, indicated that it came from evaluation by the IOC of what we have done as a partnership to date. They realized that we haven't focused on recovery in the past. However, the bottom line is range wide recovery. All we can directly influence is achieving recovery in WI. It is in everyone's best interest to assure that KBB populations are sustainable in WI. Only then will the regulatory burden for this relatively common species be relieved. Dave also commented on streamlining as it relates to management protocols and guidelines, because as it stands now, they are very confusing and often inconsistent in what they say. With staff turnover being a more regular occurrence, information transfer will be even more important in the future.

- **THE 5-POINT PLAN:**

1. FOCUS HCP implementation on recovery areas. Ted Sickley & Crystal Fankhauser
Ted Sickley presented a habitat model based on logistic regression approach to predict the presence/absence of Karner blue butterflies using a suite of variables, such as soils, cover type, climate, known KBB sites, last frost date, among others.

Copies of maps will be available to partners.

Jimmy: Recovery areas do not have to be black and white but just a matter of spending less time in those non-recovery areas. Reports would be submitted but intense monitoring would not necessarily happen.

2. STREAMLINE HCP PROCESSES

Dave Lentz cited the burden for the DNR to administer the growing partnership is something that won't be acceptable. Some examples of processes that have proven very costly, time consuming and frustrating are:

- New partner inclusion process/CI issuance
- SHCA amendment process
- Mitigation for temporary and permanent take
- Changed Circumstances reporting

The Service and DNR will need to find creative ways to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of what have become onerous processes.

3. IMPROVE PROTOCOLS AND GUIDELINES

Joe Henry & Bob Hess

Joe compiled existing management guidelines to make one consistent set of guidelines. He divided management activities into low and high intensity management activities split by Corridor, Forestry and Wildlife management activities in a table. Most activities that are commonly done are low intensity. He asked for partner input to fill in some gaps in the table, and for comments on the new compilation of guidelines.

4. RECOVER the KBB in WI

Matt: We would like to be able to demonstrate that Kbb as recovered in WI and largely a result of the land management activate being done on the landscape. Dave said that the DNR is ready to work with the Service on recovery, but we know we will need partners' help. Part of the reason progress has not been made since the FRP was approved is that DNR has not had the funding. Changing priorities will enable us to begin, but funding is no better.

Cathy commented that the recovery plan (*for reclassification*) recommends restoring 13 viable populations of KBBs in WI; recovery is recommended on 10 state lands, possibly three county lands (*and on one TNC property, Necedah NWR, Fort McCoy and Hardwood Range*) The recommendations in the recovery plan were based on where the most KBBs occurred and/or where the best potential was thought to be to restore viable KBB populations in WI.

Duran Bjorklund: Is it possible for the WI populations to be delisted if they are meeting recovery goals.

Cathy: Yes, but when depends on when recovery goals are met range-wide. Cathy explained that the KBB Recovery Plan (2003) provides recommended recovery criteria for reclassification of the KBB (from endangered to threatened) and for delisting (removal for the Federal T&E List.) A criterion for reclassification includes establishing secure viable populations with at least 3000 KBB 4 out of 5 years, and establishing large

viable metapopulations with 6000 KBBs. While *three* of the Wisconsin populations have met the KBB populations goals (*two* KBB populations at Fort McCoy and one at Necedah NWR) and one may (Crex Meadows), she does not believe that all of the WI recovery sites will be at the KBB viable population level in five years. To delist a species all the recovery goals range-wide should be met (*this includes demonstrating that KBB populations meet recovery criteria for 10 years at 15 locations in WI*). There are six other states working on recovering the KBB, with three of them (NH, IN, and OH) well into reintroduction efforts. *WI has one recommended reintroduction site, TNC's Quincy Bluff.*

Gary: WI could make enormous strides toward recovery, but it doesn't seem like we will be doing things any differently based on what the current ideology is.

Cathy: The Endangered Species Act gives us tools that can be used to reduce regulation; such as HCPs and the incidental take permits the Service issues to implement them. The closer the KBB moves towards recovery in WI, the less regulation of non-recovery areas should be necessary.

Dave: We are already using the HCP as a means of reducing regulation; the "voluntary participation strategy" provides regulatory relief while allowing incidental take.

5. Extend the TERM of the permit
Develop 10-Year ITP RENEWAL proposal

Darrell Zastrow

The Department held conversations in December, fundamentally DNR has basic needs, 1) we want to maintain partnerships, 2) We have limited resources and must be smart about priorities and spend money where we get the most bang for the buck, 3) we need to be successful, in implementing ER strategies. DNR struggled with the idea of a 50 year renewal. Every year DNR spends \$200,000 on KBB, DNR cannot do it at this pace.

Darrell said that with limited resources we should focus monitoring in the high probability areas and to assist in recovery effort. The voluntary category still maintains viability.

Steve: Knowing what we have learned today about KBB probability, why do we want to do the same thing for the next 3 years until the ITP expires before changing?

Darrell: If we can come to an agreement with FWS then we should shift gears as soon as possible. We would like to hear from the partners, what do they think of this proposal are they in favor of it. Important to understand where they are coming from so this can be shared with the DNR staff.

4. BREAK OUT SESSIONS:

Attendees split into four breakout sessions to discuss the following set of questions:

5. BREAK OUT GROUPS REPORTED OUT

Corridors Managers

Gary Birch summarized the corridor managers' group discussion. Want to focus on populations in recovery areas, not on small areas, focus on corridors that link significant populations, could do more conservation activities on corridors, but there are still disincentives that exist.

- Focus on significant populations in recovery areas and not on small populations
- Focus on corridors that link significant populations
- Could do more conservation activities, restoration on corridors, but there is a regulatory disincentive that exists (simpler to let habitat grow out)
- Redefine documented and high potential range using Ted's model.

County Forests

Bob Hess and Jody Gindt reported for county forests. 1) Discussion involved creating a GIS map depicting lupine distribution so county forests could use this as a tool to focus survey/management efforts, continue pre/post management surveys on SM lands because they are committed in doing the right thing, 2) eliminate level 2 & 3 effectiveness monitoring surveys on all unlikely sites (savings of 3 weeks minimum of full-time LTE work), 3) depends on a number of things, i.e., local politics or local economics, no promises but would consider assisting with Rx (Prescribed) Bx (Burning), or monitoring, change SM acres to long-term recovery property in some areas,

- Generate statewide lupine habitat map to focus monitoring efforts
- Want to continue to do pre-management surveys
- Want to stop doing effectiveness monitoring (level 2 and 3)
- Might be able to help other properties with monitoring
- Change shifting mosaic acres to long-term recovery areas

Industrial Forests

Joel Aanensen reported for the industry breakout group 1 & 2) What we need to stop is wasting time/money in green areas but concentrate efforts in the orange and red areas. 3) Some of saved money/time could go toward helping to demonstrate recovery on public properties

- Focus efforts in high probability areas
- Could help with monitoring on public recovery properties

Conservation

Steve Richter reported for the conservation group. Steve commented that this break out group was comprised of mostly federal agency folks and TNC with no DNR staff in this group.

1) focus efforts in the red areas and do abundance monitoring w/ permanent transects, 2) stop monitoring lupine focus O+E only in high probability areas, reduce conservation efforts in low probability areas, 3) ID landowners within the recovery units, shift focus to recovery areas, coordinate DNR activities and USFWS recovery goals, (suggest removing items mentioned in this paragraph that are mentioned below to remove redundancy)

- Focus efforts in high probability areas (red areas)
- Do abundance monitoring in recovery areas
- Establish permanent transects in recovery areas
- Stop monitoring lupine outside of recovery areas (*workgroup recommended continuing to monitor for KBB*)
- Reduce conservation/outreach efforts in low probability areas
- Identify landowners within recovery units
- Coordinate USFWS Karner recovery goals with overall DNR goals
- Support research in recovery areas
- Use USFWS grant programs to purchase recovery properties
- Help other states achieve recovery goals
- Change ESA to allow separate listing of invertebrate subpopulations

A general discussion was held on breakout session observations:

Each break out group was asked whether the IOC and DNR should pursue developing a proposal that moves the HCP towards recovery – all groups said YES. With this response WDNR feels they have the approval of the HCP partnership to move forward in this direction.

Action: If partners had concerns about this approach, Dave asked that they contact him within one week.

Steve Richter commented that we heard a lot of great things today, but what will change this spring? Matt said these ideas will be taken and put into a more detailed proposal to give to the FWS on April 11th. We will have to see what changes can be made for the 2006 field season. Gary Birch asked if we could throw out the high potential range, and just focus on the high probability areas in the documented range. Dave said that he liked the idea of replacing the high potential range with the documented range. Partners have been surveying for several years with only a few sightings outside the original documented range. Jody Gindt asked how shifting mosaic helps with recovery and the overall Karner populations. Cathy responded that she didn't know what populations look like on forested lands, since no population estimates have been made; she also stated that the SM on forest lands was a conservation measure, rather than recovery effort. Ursula suggested establishing a funding committee and asked Cathy if there was enough empowerment from the partners to move ahead with the new plan. Dave responded that he believed there was and that he has heard a unified "Yes" from partners that demonstrating recovery of the KBB in Wisconsin is the right thing to do. Darrell responded that he hadn't heard anything contrary today, but if any partner has objections or concerns, to contact Dave in the next week. Gary Birch expressed concern about the scenario that the partnership moves towards recovery and puts a lot of resources into it, and there is still no regulatory relief. Cathy stated that the HCP is a tool that provides flexibility and will allow partners to get regulatory relief as KBBs move towards recovery and the service will strive to provide that regulatory relief partners are looking for as we move toward recovery. As we continue to demonstrate recovery the less regulation will have to be done outside recovery areas.

6. Summary and Closing (15 min.)

Matt opened the floor for any additional comments/questions about the proposal. Dave commented that the discussions were very positive today, however, he is also aware that if the regulatory costs aren't reduced to something reasonable, that some partners may consider leaving the partnership rather than renew when the ITP expires. Our tremendous success so far has been because all of the unselfish work that partners have done to make this conservation plan a success; and that it is crucial that partners try and stay in for the next round. This will depend on how much real progress we can all make on the 5-Point Plan before then; both in terms of progress toward recovery and regulatory relief.

- Set date for 2007 Winter Meeting. No date was set, but there was no objection to an early March date.
- Evaluate this meeting.

Answer the following questions:

1. Were the meeting's objectives met? Yes.
2. Was the meeting's format effective? Yes.
3. Was the meeting of value? Yes.

Jody: Good that entity groups were able to breakout because they rarely have the opportunity to do that.

What did attendees think about the location and the hotel/conference center? Both the location and the center were very good. The facility is one of few in central WI that can handle a large group and is a welcome addition.

Suggest clearly identifying any "Action Items" in the text of the document or at the end of the document.

ADJOURN at 3:00 p.m

\\HCP minutes 3-8-06.doc